

# The *auctor monasterii* of the Byzantine monastery of Veszprém Valley 1.

*Rudolf Szentgyörgyi*

Eötvös Loránd University

1. One of the early document sources written in Hungary, “The Deed of Gift of the Monastery of Veszprém Valley”, is of outstanding significance in the exploration of the history of Hungarian.<sup>1</sup> We claim no less than the following: this document, albeit written in Greek, is the earliest extant written record of Hungarian written in Hungary (preceded only by a few sources of minor significance in Arabic or in Byzantine Greek written outside Hungary but containing sporadic Hungarian lexical items).

The original document, written in Greek around the turn of the millennium, was unfortunately destroyed in a fire, and what we have today is a copy from over a century later, from 1109, that has survived as part of a Latin diploma (*Renovatio*) issued by King Coloman.

With respect to the original, now lost copy of the deed of gift, the linguistic literature practically unanimously accepts the view going back to Bálint Hóman<sup>2</sup> that it was issued around the turn of millennium (1000–1001); references to it are usually dated as “before 1002” on the basis of Szentpétery.<sup>3</sup> Thus, for historians of the Hungarian language, it has never been a matter of debate that the Deed of Gift of the Monastery of Veszprém Valley is “the earliest extant document of Hungarian of a Hungarian provenance”.<sup>4</sup> This claim

---

<sup>1</sup> This work was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and was carried out as part of Research Group on Hungarian Language History and Toponomastics (University of Debrecen – Hungarian Academy of Sciences).

<sup>2</sup> Bálint Hóman, “Szent István görög oklevele”, *Századok*, 51, 1917, p. 99–136, 225–242, 231.

<sup>3</sup> Imre Szentpétery, *Szent István király pécsváradi és pécsi alapítólevele*, *Értekezések a történeti tudományok köréből*, 24/10, 1918, Budapest, MTA, p. 51.

<sup>4</sup> Emil Jakubovich – Dezső Pais (eds.), *Ó-magyar olvasókönyv*, 1929, Pécs, Danubia, p. 14–15; Cf. István Knieza, “Padrag, Paloznak”, *Magyar Nyelv*, 42, 1947, p. 140; József Molnár – Györgyi Simon, *Magyar Nyelvelméletek*, 1980<sup>3</sup>, Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó, p. 11; Adrienn Dömötör,

was never questioned (except very recently), despite the fact that, based on an idea of István Horvát,<sup>5</sup> Gyula Morvacsik<sup>6</sup> offered a different idea and, subsequently, Györffy dated the foundation of the Greek monastery around 1018.<sup>7</sup>

Let us note in passing that Géza Érszegi, referring to the patrociny of the monastery, suggests an even later date, around 1030.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, László Holler, relying on Albin Balogh,<sup>9</sup> claims that the probable date of foundation may have been around 980,<sup>10</sup> hence he attributes the initiation of the foundation to Prince Géza, King Stephen's father, despite the fact that the Latin text of the extant document refers to *privilegium sanctum Stephani*.<sup>11</sup>

These controversies are partly rooted in the issue of whether the two Stephens mentioned in the 1109 document are the same person (King St Stephen) or whether the earlier occurrence may refer to his father, Prince Géza. In fact,

---

*Régi magyar nyelvemlékek*, 2006, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, p. 14. For further references, see László Holler, "Géza vagy István idejében alapították-e a veszprémvölgyi monostort?", *Magyar Nyelv*, 107, 2011, p. 278.

<sup>5</sup> István Horvát, "Boldog Aszszony Veszprém Völgyi Apátza Monostorának alkotó Görög Oklevele [!] Szent István Magyar Királytól Kálmán Magyar Királynak 1109-ik évi Hiteles Másolatából két Réz Táblával", *Tudományos Gyűjtemény*, 18/1, 1834, p. 85-88.

<sup>6</sup> Gyula Moravcsik, "Görög nyelvű monostorok Szent István korában", In: *Emlékkönyv Szent István király halálának kilencszázadik évfordulójára*, ed. Juszinián Serédi, 1-2, 1938, Budapest, MTA, 1, p. 416.

<sup>7</sup> György Györffy, *István király és műve*, 1983<sup>2</sup>, Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó. p. 322-323. Cf. "cr. a. 1018 aut in annis subsequentibus fundatum", ed. Georgius Györffy, *Diplomata Hungariae antiquissima. Accedunt epistolae et acta ad historiam Hungariae pertinentia*, 1. Ab anno 1000 usque ad annum 1196, 1992, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó (= DHA), p. 81.

<sup>8</sup> Géza Érszegi, "A veszprémvölgyi alapítólevél", In: *Válaszúton. Pogányság-kereszténység, kelet-nyugat. Konferencia a x-xi. század kérdéseiről*, ed. László Kredics, 2000, Veszprém, MTA Veszprémi Területi Bizottsága, p. 167, 170-172. See also: Gábor Thoroczkay, "Néhány megjegyzés a Szent István-i egyházszervezés folyamatához", In: *Fons, skepsis, lex, Ünnepi tanulmányok a 70 esztendő Makk Ferenc tiszteletére*, eds. Tibor Almási – Éva Révész – György Szabados, 2010, Szeged, Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, p. 437.

<sup>9</sup> Albin Balogh, "A veszprémvölgyi görög monostor alapítása. A legrégebb magyarországi oklevél", *Regnum*, 6, 1944-46 (1947), p. 21-30.

<sup>10</sup> L. Holler, "Géza vagy István idejében alapították-e a veszprémvölgyi monostort?", art. cit., p. 291. Cf. Idem, "Az 1109. évi veszprémvölgyi ítéletlevél néhány alapkérdéséről", *Magyar Nyelv*, 108, 2012, p. 51.

<sup>11</sup> DHA, p. 366. For further arguments supporting Géza as the founder see: Gyula László, "A magyar pénzverés kezdeteiről. Vázlat", *Századok*, 97, 1963, p. 390. Miklós Komjáthy, "A veszprémvölgyi alapítólevél kibocsátójáról", *Levéltári Közlemények*, 42, 1971, p. 33-49. Imre Timkó, *Keleti kereszténység, keleti egyházak*, 1971, Budapest, Szent István Társulat, p. 398. Cf. Gyula Kristó, *Magyarország története 895-1301*, 2003, Budapest, Osiris Kiadó. p. 88.

traditionally, either one or the other is taken to be the founder of the monastery. As a result, researchers tried to resolve the puzzle of dating on the basis of the intentions (like Prince Imre's planned matrimony) or measures or historical events related to the "founder" (the prince or the king). It is quite obvious that we cannot reliably decide whether the foundation took place in the time of Prince Géza or St Stephen on the basis of arguments related to either of them.

However, if we ask whether it was Géza or Stephen who founded the monastery of Veszprém Valley, the answer is this: in an ecclesiastic legal sense, neither of them did. The person who actually founded the monastery – in terms of ecclesiastic history or ecclesiastic law – cannot be either of the two sovereigns. This recognition may bring us closer to the issue of the time of foundation, too. The key is the mysterious expression *auctor monasterii* in the *Renovatio*.

2. The author of the Latin diploma of 1109, reinstating the Greek nuns in their property, copied the text of the original Greek document as an introduction or preface to the Latin text of the *Renovatio*. The authenticity of the Greek text is ensured by Bishop Simon, the author of the Latin text and the copier of the Greek one. King Coloman found the bishop to be the most suitable person for investigating the case of the monastery of Veszprém Valley. We know from another source that he had been commissioned by King Coloman to be involved in international diplomacy concerning Byzantine affairs; hence his command of Greek is beyond doubt. In addition, he was well-versed in the habits of the Byzantine church and in Greek diplomatics (as well as, of course, in Latin diplomatics).

In view of the fact that issuing diplomas in Latin had a century of history behind it by the early twelfth century, the Greek text of the Veszprém Valley diploma calls for an explanation. Bishop Simon himself provides the following explanation within the text of the Latin diploma: "*Vetus autem priuilegium iuxta linguam auctoris monasterii grece scriptum*" (transcribed from the original diploma<sup>12</sup>) – that is, 'the old deed of gift had been written in Greek, the language of the founder of the monastery'. The reference to the Greek identity of the *auctor* turned out to be difficult to interpret throughout the history of research.

The idea that the founder, be it either Géza or Stephen, was a speaker of Greek, is indeed not easy to come to grips with. Although Gábor Krajnyák confidently stated that "the holy king must have had a good command of

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. DHA. p. 377.

Greek”,<sup>13</sup> and Holler also claims, more cautiously, that Géza may have been familiar with the Greek language,<sup>14</sup> neither of them drew any firm conclusion with respect to the issue of who the founder was. On the other hand, the idea of some researchers that what is referred to by *iuxta linguam* is ‘speaking Greek as a second language’ is rather far-fetched.

That contradiction can be resolved, in principle, in two different manners.

1. If either Géza or Stephen founded the monastery, the word *auctor* must be given a different interpretation. 2. If the Greek-speaking *auctor* is the founder of the monastery, a different role has to be found for Prince Géza or King Stephen in the legal act of founding the monastery.

3. Given that, traditionally, either Géza or Stephen is taken to be the founder of the monastery, researchers had to give the word *auctor* some different interpretation. The following “solutions” have been proposed so far: The *auctor* is not the founder himself but

1. the proprietor of the monastery, that is, the community of Greek-speaking nuns,<sup>15</sup>

2. the first *igumenia* (abbess),<sup>16</sup> or

3. a person who was not necessarily a native speaker of Greek but whose liturgical language was Greek,<sup>17</sup> for instance:

a) Géza’s wife, Sarolt,<sup>18</sup>

b) Prince Imre’s future wife,<sup>19</sup>

c) King Stephen’s sister, the subsequently exiled wife of Gavril Radomir, the Tsar of Bulgaria,<sup>20</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Gábor Krajnyák, “Szent István veszprémvölgyi donatiójának görög egyházi vonatkozásai”, *Századok*, 59-60, 1925–1926, p. 499.

<sup>14</sup> L. Holler, “Géza vagy István idejében alapították-e a veszprémvölgyi monostort?”, art. cit., p. 289.

<sup>15</sup> Dezső Pais, “Az ‘auctor monasterii’ a veszprémvölgyi apácák Kálmán-féle megerősítő levelében”, *Magyar Nyelv*, 36, 1940, p. 42.

<sup>16</sup> Gyula Czebe, *A veszprémvölgyi oklevél görög szövege*, Értekezések a történeti tudományok köréből, 24/3, 1916, Budapest, MTA, p. 112. Jenő Darkó, “A veszprémi apácamonostor alapító-levelének 1109.-i másolatáról”, *Egyetemes Philológiai Közlöny*, 41, 1917, p. 348.

<sup>17</sup> János Melich, “A magyar nyelv szláv jövevényei”, 1. közlemény, *Magyar Nyelv*, 6, 1910, p. 294.

<sup>18</sup> János Melich, *A honfoglaláskor Magyarország*, 1925–1929, Budapest, MTA, p. 39.

<sup>19</sup> I. Horvát, “Boldog Aszszony Veszprém Völgyi Apátza Monostorának alkotó Görög Öklevele”, art. cit., p. 89. Gy. Györffy, *István király és műve*, op. cit., p. 322.

<sup>20</sup> Bertalan Dudás – László Legeza – Péter Szacsavay, *Baziliták*, 1993, Budapest, Mikes Kiadó, p. 15.

- d) the exiled Tsarina's son, conceived in Bulgaria, Géza's grandson,<sup>21</sup>
- e) the person who first had the idea of founding the monastery,<sup>22</sup>
- f) or the "originator" of founding the monastery<sup>23</sup>
- g) who probably was a Greek priest.<sup>24</sup>
- h) Or else the reference to a speaker of Greek is a speculative idea of the writer of the Renovation,<sup>25</sup>
- i) "Bishop Simon's (...) well-meant idea",<sup>26</sup>
- j) or an explanation intended to gloss over the fact that the actual founder had been Géza.<sup>27</sup>
- k) Or the text becomes intelligible if completed into "iuxta linguam auctoris privilegii monasterii graece scriptum", that is: the deed of gift was written in Greek because its author (writer) was a speaker of Greek.<sup>28</sup>

This plethora of possibilities of interpretation (mostly sheer guessing in fact) raises one's suspicion, especially since it contradicts the medieval legal practice of trying to be clear and unambiguous in order to avoid subsequent litigation.

As another possible solution, it can be argued that the Greek-speaking *auctor*, quite on the contrary, is the actual founder of the monastery. (In this case, we have to find a different role for Prince Géza or King Stephen in the legal act of founding the monastery.) As far as I know, no attempt has been made so far to resolve this controversy from this angle.

4. In medieval Latin sources, the terms *fundator* and *auctor* are often used synonymously: e.g. "*auctor civitatis, id est fundator ut Romulus Romae*" ('the creator or founder of the city as Romulus in the case of Rome' – as Honorius Augustodunensis notes in the first half of the twelfth century<sup>29</sup>).

<sup>21</sup> M. Komjáthy, "A veszprémvölgyi alapítólevél kibocsátójáról", art. cit., p. 45-6, on the basis of Géza Fehér, "A bolgár egyház kísérletei és sikerei hazánkban", *Századok*, 61-62, 1927-1928, p. 12-16.

<sup>22</sup> Gy. Czebe, *A veszprémvölgyi oklevél görög szövege*, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>23</sup> *Magyar Katolikus Lexikon*, ed. István Diós, Budapest, Szent István Társulat, 1993-2010, Under: 'veszprémvölgyi görög alapítólevél'.

<sup>24</sup> A. Balogh, "A veszprémvölgyi görög monostor alapítása", art. cit., p. 23.

<sup>25</sup> I. Szentpétery, *Szent István király pécsváradi és pécsi alapítólevele*, op. cit., p. 193-194.

<sup>26</sup> B. Hóman, "Szent István görög oklevele", art. cit., p. 232-233.

<sup>27</sup> L. Holler, "Az 1109. évi veszprémvölgyi ítéletlevél néhány alapkérdéséről", art. cit., p. 69.

<sup>28</sup> János Karácsonyi, *Szent István király élete*, Budapest, Szent-István-Társulat, 1904, p. 60.

<sup>29</sup> *Patrologiae Cursus Completus seu Bibliotheca Universalis [...] Omnium SS Patrum, Doctorum*

In the usage of the ecclesiastic law of the time, the meaning of *fundator ecclesiae* and *auctor ecclesiae* likewise appears to be (but only appears to be) identical: ‘the founder of a church’, see e.g. before 1186: Reginaldus abbas Ramesiensis nove *auctor ecclesie*<sup>30</sup> ~ 1296: S. Ladislai regis, qui est *fundator ipsius ecclesiae*<sup>31</sup>. Similarly, the meaning of both *fundator monasterii* and *auctor monasterii* seems to be the same: ‘the founder of a monastery’.

5. With respect to medieval Western monasteries, the word *founder* usually refers, on the one hand, to a typically non-ecclesiastic person (king, nobleman) who builds a monastery, normally on his own property, and sponsors the lives of monks by gifts and other privileges. On the other hand, the word *founder* also refers to the ecclesiastic person or community that ensures the monks’ presence in the new monastery: that sends or issues the new community or who, even more typically, serves as the (future) leader of the monks’ community: organises and begins the community’s life. The founder in this (stricter, ecclesiastic-legal) sense is necessarily an ecclesiastic person: either the immediate superior of the community or else a non-immediate superior who has the filiation control rights.<sup>32</sup> Medieval Latin sources distinguish “outside” and “inside” participants of founding a monastery from one another in unambiguous terms.

6. The term *fundator* normally refers to the non-ecclesiastic (or sometimes even ecclesiastic) person providing the external circumstances of the monastery’s life (buildings, lands, and other things necessary for subsistence), that is, the “external founder”. Cf. e.g. 935: dominus Hermannus, *fundator eiusdem monasterii*,<sup>33</sup> 1075: archiepiscopus Coloniensis, multorum *fundator monasteriorum*,<sup>34</sup> 1086: Leupoldus marchio Austrie (...) Leupoldus Largus

---

*Scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum* [...], Series Latina, 1-217, accurante Jacques-Paul Migne, 1844–1855, Parisiis, New edition: 1880–1895 [*Patrologia Latina* = PL.], Tom. 172, col. 348.

<sup>30</sup> PL. Tom. 160, col. 446.

<sup>31</sup> *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, 1-11, Studio et opera Georgii Fejér, 1829–1844, Buda [= Fejér], Tom. 4/3, p. 504-505.

<sup>32</sup> For the latter, see Rudolf Szentgyörgyi, “Cikádor”, *Helnyévtörténeti Tanulmányok*, 6, 2011, p. 8.

<sup>33</sup> Georg Waitz (ed.), “Annales Sancti Blasii Brunsvicensis (310, 905–1314)”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum*, 24, 1879, Hannoverae, Bibliopolii Hahniani, p. 824.

<sup>34</sup> Oswald Holder-Egger (ed.), “Flores temporum auctore fratre ordinis Minorum Suevo (–1292)”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum, op. cit.*, 24, 1879, p. 238.

filii eius (...) *fundator monasteriorum* sancte Crucis et in Neuburch,<sup>35</sup> 1091: Altmannus episcopus Pataviensis (...) *fundator monasterii* Chotwicensis,<sup>36</sup> 1124: pii *fundatores* Huno et Fredericus huic *monasterio*,<sup>37</sup> 1130: primus huius provincie princeps *fundatoris monasterii* Reynirsborn,<sup>38</sup> 1138: miles Guntrammus, primus *fundator monasterii* in Salem,<sup>39</sup> 1142: Conradus, filius S. Leopoldi (...) Austriae Marchionis, *monasterii* ad S. Crucem *fundatoris*,<sup>40</sup> 1201: dux et princeps egregius Bolezlaus Altus dictus, *fundator cenobii* Lubensis,<sup>41</sup> 1211: *Monasterium*, ubi etiam *fundatoris* corpus pie et devote sepultum requiescit,<sup>42</sup> after 1250: genealogia et (...) nomina nobilissimorum principum *fundatorum monasterii* sancte Marie in Dyessen,<sup>43</sup> 1251: comite Ricardo, eiusdem *monasterii fundatore*,<sup>44</sup> 1269: Thomas quondam Palatinus, *fundator monasterii* Erchy,<sup>45</sup> 1300: per diuos Reges Hungarie et alios viros Christicolos *fundatores ipsorum Monasteriorum*,<sup>46</sup> etc.

Similarly in medieval Hungarian sources: *fundatora az Calafstromnak* (...) Volt eegy nagy kazdag wrnak egy ffya (...) attya annya (...) Az varath zen-toleek *kalafstrommaa* ‘the founder of the cloister (...)’. There was a son of

<sup>35</sup> Wilhelm Wattenbach (ed.), “Annales Osterhovenses (43–1313, 1365–1433)”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum, op. cit.*, 17, 1861, p. 540.

<sup>36</sup> Philipp Jaffé (ed.), “Auctarium Ekkehardi Altahense (508–1139)”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum, op. cit.*, 17, 1861, p. 365.

<sup>37</sup> G. Waitz (ed.), “Historia monasterii Rastedensis”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum, op. cit.*, 25, 1880, p. 500.

<sup>38</sup> O. Holder-Egger (ed.), “Cronica Reinhardsbunnensis (530–1338)”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum, op. cit.*, 30, Pars 1, 1896, p. 531.

<sup>39</sup> G. Waitz (ed.), “Historia brevis monasterii Salemitani (1134–1210)”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum, op. cit.*, 24, 1879, p. 646.

<sup>40</sup> Fejér, Tom. 7/4, p. 60.

<sup>41</sup> Walter W. Arndt, “Epitaphia ducum Silesiae (1162–1342)”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum, op. cit.*, 19, 1866, p. 550.

<sup>42</sup> László Erdélyi – Pongrácz Sörös (eds.), *A pannonhalmi Szent Benedek-rend története 1–12/B. 1902–1916*, Budapest, Szent-István-Társulat, Tom. 10, p. 502.

<sup>43</sup> Ph. Jaffé (ed.), “De fundatoribus monasterii Diessensis (954–1250)”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum, op. cit.*, 17, 1861, p. 328.

<sup>44</sup> Felix Liebermann – Reinhold Pauli (eds.), “Thomas de Wykes canonicus Osneiensis, Chronicon, Excerpta (1147–1287)”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum, op. cit.*, 27, 1885, p. 491.

<sup>45</sup> Fejér, Tom. 4/3, p. 498.

<sup>46</sup> *Hazai okmánytár / Codex diplomaticus patrius 1–8. 1–5*, eds. Imre Nagy – Iván Paur – Károly Ráth – Dezső Véghely, 1865–1873, Győr, Sauerwein, 6–8, eds. Arnold Ipolyi – Imre Nagy – Dezső Véghely, Franklin, Budapest, 1876–1891, Tom. 7, p. 301.

a rich nobleman (...); his father and mother (...) consecrated the castle into a cloister'.<sup>47</sup>

We also have to mention here the “originator’s function” mentioned earlier as one of the possible meanings of *auctor*, e.g. 1347?: Bonifacius, Moguntinus archiepiscopus, Germanie apostolus, Fuldensis *fundator monasterii*.<sup>48</sup> The Abbey of Fulda was founded in 744 by Sturm, a disciple of Bonifacius, on the latter’s authority.

7. On the other hand, the “internal” or ecclesiastic founder of the monastery who, at least temporarily, is also the superior of the community in an ecclesiastic-legal sense, normally its abbot, is usually referred to as *auctor*. Cf. e.g. after 724: beatus Pirminus [abbas] *auctor multorum monasteriorum*,<sup>49</sup> after 752: hoc fuit principale propositum in illis, qui fuerunt *auctores Monasteriorum* [...]. Illud idem fenerat Pater Benedictus Santiffimus,<sup>50</sup> after 931: monasterio [...], ubi Boso *auctor monasterii* et Berta abb[atissa] preesse uidentur (...) S[ancti] Bosonis *auctoris monasterii*,<sup>51</sup> 1080–1095: [abbatis] Gerald, qui postea Silvae-Majoris in Aquitania *monasterii auctor* fuit,<sup>52</sup> etc.

This consistent use of the expression *auctor monasterii* casts serious doubt on the validity of the multifarious interpretations of the word *auctor* that I referred to earlier on. It is also easy to see that this use of the term *auctor* does not correspond to its legal sense in general: typically, the person “whom the legal action stated in the document is due to”<sup>53</sup> is the *fundator*. Consequently, it is no wonder – rather, it is made quite justified by the aim and genre of these writings – that both in historical treatises and in the text of original

<sup>47</sup> *Érdy-kódex, 1526–1527. Manuscriptum* (<http://erdykodex.atw.hu>), fol. 508, 512.

<sup>48</sup> Fedor Schneider (ed.), “Iohannes abbas Victoriensis, Liber certarum Historiarum 1-2”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* 36/1-2, 1909–1910, Hannoverae–Lipsiae, Bibliopolii Hahniani, Tom. 1, p. 61.

<sup>49</sup> W. Wattenbach (ed.), “Annales Osterhovenses (43–1313, 1365–1433)”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum, op. cit.*, 17, 1861, p. 538.

<sup>50</sup> *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, Tomus secundus, Collegit, ordinavit & praefationibus auxit Lodovico Antonio Muratori, Mediolani, 1723, p. 360.

<sup>51</sup> Eduard Hlawitschka – Karl Schmid – Gerd Tellenbach (eds.), “Liber Memorialis Romaricensis 1-2”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Libri Memoriales* 1/1-2, 1970, Dublin – Zürich, Weidmann, Tom. 1, p. 119-120.

<sup>52</sup> PL. Tom. 147, col. 1005.

<sup>53</sup> Imre Szentpétery, *Magyar Oklevéltan. A magyarországi középkori okleveles gyakorlat ismertetése*, 1930, Budapest, Magyar Történelmi Társulat, p. 5.



documents referring to donations or related legal events, the word *fundator* occurs more often by several magnitudes than the word *auctor* does.<sup>54</sup>

8. In medieval sources the words *fundator* and *auctor* sometimes even occur together. This is a reasonable solution whenever the “external” initiator of the foundation of the monastery is an ecclesiastic person (for instance, a bishop) who later becomes a superior of the monastery in an ecclesiastic-legal sense, too, e.g. on Abbot Ursmer (Ursmarus) of the founder abbot of Lobbes: 10th century (?): *fundator et auctor eiusdem monasterii*,<sup>55</sup> that is: ‘the *fundator* [= external founder] and *auctor* [= internal founder, founding abbot] of the same abbey’. (It is to be noted that the ecclesiastic literature written in Latin in modern times does not necessarily show sensitivity to that distinction.) Nevertheless, in medieval sources, those two “activities” coincide far more frequently than the cooccurrence of the two terms *fundator* and *auctor* would suggest. In such cases, in view of the aim and genre of those writings, as was mentioned earlier, the founder is typically referred to as *fundator*; cf. e.g. 13th century: sanctus Gerardus, *fundator et primus abbas cenobii sancti Petri Broniensis*,<sup>56</sup> given that Gerhard of Brogne founded the monastery in his own estate and became its first abbot (on the other hand, the term *primus abbas* is equivalent to *auctor* here).

For completeness’ sake, we have to mention yet another possible use of the expression *fundator monasterii* in medieval ecclesiastic language. Looking back to early times when no “external help” was required for the foundation of a monastery, the founding abbot (that is, the *auctor* of the later terminology) was also referred to as *fundator*, especially if the spiritual influence of the monastery had spread on (for instance, if the person founded a congregation or indeed a new monastic order). For example, before 1115: Sanctus Benedictus, *Primus abbas et fundator huius monasterii*<sup>57</sup> (in fact, the expression *primus abbas* does evoke the meaning of *auctor* in this case, too).

Other aspects or roles, referring exclusively to non-ecclesiastic founders, are also differentiated in medieval diplomas (less frequently, in documents

<sup>54</sup> Cf. L. Holler, “Az 1109. évi veszprémvölgyi ítéletlevél néhány alapkérdéséről”, art. cit., p. 67.

<sup>55</sup> G. Waitz (ed.), “Monumenta Historiae Lobiensis”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum*, op. cit., 14, 1883, p. 554.

<sup>56</sup> Johannes Heller (ed.), “Aegidius Aureaevalensis, Gesta episcoporum Leodiensium”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum*, op. cit., 25, 1880, p. 51.

<sup>57</sup> Hartmut Hoffmann (ed.), “Chronica monasterii Casinensis [Redactio 1, cod. A]”, In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum*, op. cit., 34, 1980, p. 11.

of other genres) by conjunctions of terms like *fundator et constructor* (e.g. 1342: Martinus, quondam Banus, *fundator et constructor* ipsius Monastery de Saagh<sup>58</sup>), *fundator et dotator* (e.g. 1263: Kolosmonostura [...], cuius *fundator et dotator* [...] Rex Hungariae, proauus noster<sup>59</sup>), *fundator et patronus* (e.g. 1224: nobilis vir, Micha Comes, *fundator et patronus* monasterii Thaliki;<sup>60</sup> 1271: Ricardus rex Alemannie [...] sepultusque est in monasterio de Hailea, cuius *patronus* extitit *et fundator*;<sup>61</sup> 1442: Mortunus quondam Banus *fundator et Patronus* eiusdem Monastery de Saagh<sup>62</sup>).

9. In sum, the medieval sources confirm our claim that the expression *auctor monasterii* in King Coloman's diploma of renovation of 1109 clearly refers to the founder of the monastery, more particularly, its "internal", ecclesiastic organiser and superior in the ecclesiastic-legal sense, who was said to be a speaker of Greek (and a representative of Greek liturgy). Or rather, this would be the case if the monastery of Veszprém Vally had been founded as a Western type community. But how does all that relate to Eastern type monasticism? And who in fact was the misterious actual founder, the Greek-speaking *auctor monasterii*? In order to properly answer those questions, another talk will be necessary.

<sup>58</sup> Fejér, Tom. 8/4, p. 623.

<sup>59</sup> Fejér, Tom. 4/3, p. 106.

<sup>60</sup> Fejér, Tom. 3/1, p. 450.

<sup>61</sup> Felix Liebermann (ed.), "Matheus Westmonasteriensis [Pseudo], Flores historiarum, Excerpta (1154–1307)", In: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum, op. cit.*, 28, 1888, p. 484.

<sup>62</sup> Fejér, Tom. 8/7, p. 347-348.